S/N: 10/596,049

Reply to Office Action of 4/30/08

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application, of which claims 1-11 are rejected. By

this paper, Applicant cancels claims 1-11. New claims 12-22 are hereby presented to claim the

original subject matter in a manner formatted to U.S. standards. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner consider these new claims.

The specification has been objected to. By this paper, Applicant has cancelled

claims 1-11, to address these objections. By this paper, Applicant amends pages 5 and 8 of the

specification.

The drawings including pending Figures 1-11, are objected to. By this paper, the

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-11, to address these drawing objections.

-8-

S/N: 10/596,049

Reply to Office Action of 4/30/08

Drawing Objections - 37 C.F.R. § 1.83

Objection of the drawings for not showing a feature specified in the claims

The drawings are objected under 37 C.F.R. §1.83 (a) for not showing the

sword like hand protector of claim 1. By this amendment, this feature has been cancelled from

the claims.

Drawing Objections - 37 C.F.R. § 1.84

Objection of the drawings for a character being referenced by different features

The drawings are objected under 37 C.F.R. § (p)(4) for reference character 62

being used to reference "guiding ramps" and "lifting ramps". The reference character (64) was

used to designate "lifting ramps" in claim 4 and claim 5, whereas the specification described

"guiding ramps" (64). By this amendment, claims 4 and 5 are cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully request that the Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Claim Objections - Informalities

Objection of the claims for referencing characters not enclosed in parentheses

The claims are objected to for referencing characters which are not enclosed in

parentheses. By this amendment, claims 1-11 are cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests that the Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Objection of claim 1 for informalities

Claim 1 is objected to for the transporting tube referencing character 19, while in

-9-

S/N: 10/596,049

Reply to Office Action of 4/30/08

the specification, the transporting tube references character 22. By this amendment, claim 1 is cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Claim Objections - 37 C.F.R § 1.75 (c)

Objection of claims for being of improper dependent form

Claims 5, 7, 9 and 11 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75 (c) for failing to further limit the subject matter of independent claim 1. By this Amendment claims 5,7,9 and 11 are cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112 - Paragraph 1

Rejection of claims 1-11 for not being enabled by the specification

Claims 1-11are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, regarding the method and or means for determining the distance to the target and enlarging or reducing the area of dispersion. Claims 1-11 are cancelled by this amendment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Claim 1 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, as being based on a disclosure that is not enabling, regarding the method of determining the distance to the target and regarding the method of enlarging or reducing the area of dispersion. The examiner states that these methods are critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not claimed or disclosed. The summary of the invention section in the specification, concluded with a paragraph stating, "[t]he various essential parts mentioned in this description and the drawings can be used individually or together in any combination with other elements having different characteristics

S/N: 10/596,049

Reply to Office Action of 4/30/08

and uses." (Emphasis added). The paragraph concludes by referencing features of the handgun,

including the laser sight. This statement is a contradiction, and the specification as currently

amended removes the word "essential" from the paragraph. Additionally, claim 1 is cancelled

by this amendment. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider new claims 12-

22.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, as not being enabled.

By this amendment claim 2 is cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the

Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, as not being enabling.

By this amendment claim 8 is cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the

Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112 - Paragraph 2

Rejection of claims 1-11 for being indefinite

Claims 1-11are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being

indefinite. By this amendment claim 1-11 are cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests that the Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Rejection of claims 1 for being incomplete

Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being incomplete.

By this amendment claim 1 is cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the

Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

Rejection of claims 1-6, 10 and 11 for insufficient antecedent basis

-11-

S/N: 10/596,049

Reply to Office Action of 4/30/08

Claims 1- 6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis. By this amendment claims 1-6, 10 and 11 are cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider new claims 12-22.

S/N: 10/596,049

Reply to Office Action of 4/30/08

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Fernando Jorge Maldonado Ferreira Lopes

By /John E. Nemazi/

John E. Nemazi Reg. No. 30,876 Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: July 30, 2008

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 Fax: 248-358-3351